

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
MARCH 11th, 2010**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a regular session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building, on Thursday March 11, at 4:30 PM Commissioners present were: Chair Jerry Leimenstoll, Angela Carmichael, Cassandra Rogers, Bob Mays, and Dawn Chaney. Staff included Dan Curry, Dyan Arkin, Barbara Harris and Cyndi Blue, representing the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD), and Rashad Young, Greensboro City Manager. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 11, 2010 REGULAR MEETING

Chair Leimenstoll stated that in his opinion the minutes from the February meeting needed to be substantially revised. He feels they are incomplete and do not represent some of the more significant discussion that took place. He asked that staff review the tape and present a revised set of minutes. Mr. Mays stated that he noticed in the South Elm Street Redevelopment, the discussion towards the end, did not accurately reflect what the action items were to be.

Dyan Arkin stated that if the Commission would like to give staff some direction on the changes they would like to see it would help staff in the review of the minutes. Chair Leimenstoll stated that there are always interpretive aspects to minutes. The minutes are a legal document and a legal representation of what transpired. He did not feel it was appropriate to give staff direction on what should be included.

Dan Curry asked if the minutes did not cover all of the items or if there was incorrect information. Chair Leimenstoll stated the minutes did not cover all of the items. Mr. Mays was disappointed and believes the article in the *Business Journal* summarized the discussion better than the minutes.

Ms. Rogers pointed out typos in the introduction, and Ms. Chaney pointed out that her name was misspelled.

No motion was made, and a revised set of minutes will be presented at the next regular meeting.

2. WILLOW OAKS AND EASTSIDE PARK REDEVELOPMENT AREAS: Lincoln Grove Apartments Low Income Housing Tax Credit Application

Ms. Arkin stated the Commission has been presented with a brief memo explaining that Wynnefield Properties has come to the City with a preliminary tax credit application for the next round of low income housing tax credits for the Lincoln Grove apartments.

Cyndi Blue stated she primarily works with nonprofit and for profit developers to develop or rehabilitate affordable housing for ownership, rental, or supportive housing. This project is one of the oldest in the city's rental portfolio. It is one of the first tax credit projects the City did. It is a 116 unit scattered site located to the north of the Willow Oaks boundary and in the center of the Willow Oaks boundary. Ms. Blue pointed out some additional parcels on the map that would be part of Wynnefield's project, but not part of the tax credit application. The Community Center was also pointed out per request of Chair Leimenstoll.

Ms. Blue stated this had been one of the first rehabilitations to occur in the Lincoln Grove area. The units have been fairly well maintained, but as new construction has come in Willow Oaks, they are finding themselves challenged to keep the units filled. The original project structure does not give them a great deal of flexibility in rent. They were competing with new tax credit development. The Lincoln Grove

partnership submitted to staff an intricate proposal to resolve the issue. The proposal includes demolishing the existing one story units located on the two parcels and replacing them with two story craftsman-styled buildings. Preliminary plans are currently being reviewed by staff and the Town Architect for Willow Oaks. Wynnefield is working with staff and trying to create something that is complementary to Willow Oaks. The developer would like the City to reinvest in the units that are being rebuilt. They are proposing to give to the City the projects that are not located in this proposed redevelopment in exchange for an appropriate reduction in the original loan balance. It is basically a swap of land for cash.

This proposal opens up a number of opportunities including acquisition of units at the end of Avalon Trace near where the Commission already owns property [along South English within the Willow Oaks redevelopment area]. Chair Leimenstoll asked for those properties to be shown on the map. The properties not of the Commission's interest on Lowdermilk Street would be sold.

Chair Leimenstoll asked what area the lines on the map presented. Ms. Arkin stated that the map is a study area from some earlier work and shows Willow Oaks and some of Eastside Park. Mr. Curry stated that the boundary between the two projects runs along Spencer Street.

Mr. Curry stated that this is an update for the Commission on things happening in the redevelopment area. There is no action needed from the Commission.

Ms. Blue stated that this is likely one of the best resolution to the marketing problem they had, and it also achieves many of the Commission's objectives for the area including improving the housing conditions in the greater Willow Oaks and Eastside Park areas. Staff feels it is a good proposal, but evaluation of the plans and financing will still need to be done.

Chair Leimenstoll asked if the Town Architect would have the same responsibilities for this project as for the Willow Oaks area. Mr. Curry stated that he would offer his services, but they will not necessarily be required to follow his suggestions. However, that depends on the agreement worked out between the City and the developer. Ms. Arkin stated that he is reviewing the plan and making suggestions. The developer has expressed interest in working with him to ensure these units are comparable with other development in the redevelopment areas.

For the benefit of new members, Mr. Mays stated that the Town Architect served an advisory role in development standards for this entire development. It costs for his services, but the money is well spent to ensure planning and implementation is correct. Chair Leimenstoll stated that the Commission and the City have an investment in the area; an investment financially and socially. One of the key aspects of the returns being seen is the Town Architect. It seems that since this is within the redevelopment area, the Commission should take steps to make sure that similar standards are met by this development.

Mr. Curry stated that was a reasonable expectation, and that is part of the negotiation the City will have. Chair Leimenstoll asked how reasonable that would be for the potential developer. Ms. Blue stated it would depend on the suggestions of the Town Architect. Minor modifications are likely to be well received; significant changes that affect the cost structure might not be.

Chair Leimenstoll stated that having a Town Architect ensures that standards are met, and the developments the Commission has overseen would not have the quality they do without his services.

Ms. Blue stated that the developer was originally sent the design standards for Willow Oaks. The developer sent back their architect's first attempt. Those plans are now under review. The final applications for the Housing Tax Credit program is early May. The design will be finalized between now and then.

Chair Leimenstoll encouraged the Town Architect to follow this proposal through. It is in the best interest of the redevelopment projects in the area and what this development can add to them. Otherwise, it will be a redevelopment project with some holes. He does not believe that is what the Commission or the City wants.

3. SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a. Site Marketing Plan

Mr. Curry stated the Commission asked staff at the last meeting to bring a collection of information as well as, hopefully, the City Manager to talk briefly about the City's commitment to the redevelopment project. A brief memo was presented to the Commission summarizing where the project is at in term of the pre-marketing work. The Commission was also presented with information they requested on the marketing strategy. The draft strategy is still being worked on, updated, and awaiting feedback from the Commission.

Rashad Young, City Manager, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to come. He wanted to express the support of both the Manager's Office and the administration. He stated this was one of the key projects that his office is discussing on a regular basis. He understands that there have been many changes with regard to proposals. The City is committed to focusing on the master developer concept on the site to make sure the entire site is developed with the continuity and standards the Commission expects. The City will also participate in the project from the public infrastructure standpoint. They will determine the extent of their involvement from the gap analysis review, in order to meet the "but for" standards for public participation. This will help outline the appropriate amount for them to invest. But the commitment is there for a mixed-use development with affordable housing, and they want to do their part to get it done. The staff and the Commission have Mr. Young's full support and enthusiasm for getting this project complete.

Chair Leimenstoll expressed the Commission's appreciation for Mr. Young's attendance and the opportunity to have a discussion with him about the project.

Mr. Mays stated that he appreciated Mr. Young's attendance, but he doesn't feel it addresses his concern. Mr. Mays asked if the Council was up to speed on the project, and supportive of the type of infrastructure and improvements that might be necessary.

Mr. Young stated that staff has not gone to Council with "what-if" approach on the project. He believes, from Council's perspective, that seeing redevelopment on this site is important to them. When the other issues came up about what direction to take, with the master developer and the hotel project, the Council members were very engaged in that, and want to see development happen. He believes that Council support of infrastructure depends on what is recommended in terms a financing structure and the total cost. He feels confident that a vast majority of the Council is supportive of the concept. He is not prepared at this point to ask for the Council's support of public infrastructure without a clearer concept of what that might be.

Mr. Mays stated that the way this has been looked at there will need to be a parking deck. The Council has already come out publicly against building a new parking deck at this time. So the RFP will go out to developers with this understanding. He asked how to clarify an \$8 million parking deck when the Council has not spoken to that and how is the Manager going to get the Council to approve COPs or other financing tools. There currently is not abundant financing available for developers. The developers will ask what the City can do to help, and those questions cannot be answered at this point.

Mr. Young stated that he would not ask the Council to give a blanket commitment for a project that has not been completely defined. The issue with the parking deck in Council briefings is that they are not yet sure that demand projections for the CBD justifies the expense right now. If a project came forward in the

CBD that would push the demand to where a parking deck is justified, he believes the Council would move forward with the expenditure for the sake of the development. If a development was presented where certain uses on the site require parking, and they know what the investment levels of the developer are, he does not have any issue presenting the need for a parking structure to the Council if that is what is needed to make the project work. Infrastructure would be funded through COPs or revenue bonds and not from the general fund, which will likely make the Council more comfortable with the investment.

Mr. Mays stated his concern was that the original plan had been in the works for seven years, and that it was abandoned for a proposed plan for about four months. In talking to developers that had at one time been interested in the project, they are no longer interested seeing the changes that could happen. He does not think at this point that City staff has the expertise to develop this RFP because they are not experienced with commercial development on this scale. He was originally in support of a technical group to help staff, but now he feels that a paid expert might be necessary. He feels it is important to hire an expert to develop the RFP.

Mr. Curry added some information about financial commitments. There are already two financial commitments for the project: \$395,000 in HOME Funds already allocated to partially cover the affordable housing subsidies, and \$500,000 funding allocated for infrastructure development on site, primarily for streets and utilities. This is not the big pieces that might be needed, but it does show a commitment by the City.

Mr. Mays stated that there were tremendous inherited federal requirements for funding of certain types of residential development and other requirements on how things are done for the development. These are viewed both positively and negatively by developers. To make an RFP effective for a broad spectrum of developers, it is important to answer as many of the questions as possible. There can be no doubt that the City is going to help make this happen, and right now that is not evident. The last thing a developer wants is a surprise. There are also substantial stormwater requirements for this project. This is not an easy project, and it needs the commitment necessary to make it successful.

Chair Leimenstoll stated that his greatest concern was about posture. Reviewing the October RFP, the RFP outlines the minimum development requirements, a whole gamut of information on what this project is about. Negotiations have to take place. This is a very high density project, and it is very complicated. There are many things that will require cooperation. He feels that the City is operating in a closed-arms posture and needs to be more open to compromises and negotiations. If this project is going to work, all parties involved—the City Council, the City Staff, and the Redevelopment Commission—need to work in an open arms posture with potential developers and have an exchange of ideas and compromise. This is a community issue, and this project could create a community. He said that if the parties involved could not work with an open arms posture he could not be involved.

Mr. Young stated that partnerships and collaboration are essential. That is the way the City needs to operate and that is the culture that is being built into the organization. They need to be on the same page as they go down the path of this project. That is the same conversation being had with the Council. He and staff work for the Council, but they will do their part to talk about the importance of that.

Ms. Rogers asked if it's because of the fact that there is not complete buy-in of the Council, is that why Mr. Leimenstoll is saying he would not support this. Chair Leimenstoll stated he was not saying he would not support it, but he would only support it if it was a community effort. He would not continue to work with parties that have a closed-arms posture.

Mr. Mays stated that some of the newer members may not be aware of the years of work that have gone into this project. The only reason he got onto the Commission was the South Elm Street project. When the hotel proposal came along, and everybody threw the seven years of planning out and began discussing a small part of the project area that injured the overall project vision, it was nightmare. It made

him realize that the City may not stay the course as a developer. It is a different era with financing and bringing in dependable developers. He also realized that the more requirements included, the less interest there will be. There is a disconnect between the Manager and the Commission. He not sure the Council knows how much financial investment will be required from the City to make this project work. Chair Leimenstoll agrees that the Manager cannot go to City Council and ask for support without it being more defined. The RFP will need to be brought to fruition.

Mr. Curry stated that there may be an interim step. The pre-marketing work acts not only to get information to the development community, but also to find out what developers will say about the proposed project. Based on that information, trying to think through what will actually be necessary to ask Council to support. There may be an opportunity during that phase to have some dialogue with Council. Chair Leimenstoll stated that at some point the two to three developers that are showing strong interest will make a presentation that needs to be analyzed. That can then be presented to the Council with more definition. The most important pieces of the RFP to Chair Leimenstoll are pages 4, 5, and 10, that outline the principles this project are built on. Those principles need to be explicit, understood, and evaluated at every level including City Council.

Chair Leimenstoll stated he did not understand the value of market strategy consultants Community Retail Catalysts in the process. Some of the things that came out of last month's discussion were some superficial ideas about a theme. He feels the theme the consultants came up with had no relation to the principles outlined in pages 4, 5, and 10. Mr. Mays stated that it seemed pretty pricey for the services rendered, but he would have to go through the documents given to the members about the consultant's services.

Mr. Curry stated that is part of the work staff is engaging right now. They need to be going back to the foundational elements to develop the new RFP.

Chair Leimenstoll asked Mr. Young if he was in support of paying for consultants to help develop this RFP and the project process. Mr. Young stated he was willing to hear discussion on the need of a paid consultant for the matter. He would look to Mr. Curry and his staff to give him some comments on that issue. He does not know how Council would vote on that issue, but he would advocate strongly with them if he felt that a paid consultant was necessary.

Mr. Mays stated that it may not be your typical consultant, but rather may be a developer that is not intending to bid on this project that may have good advice. It will likely require more than travel compensation.

Ms. Chaney stated that she has read about this plan as it has gone through the process, and right now she does not want to reach a stop sign. She would much rather look at what is necessary procedurally to move forward. We can not expect the Council to vote on something that the Commission does not fully understand. All the members must be educated on the next procedural step and not predetermine what the Council is going to do until they have some documentation to respond to.

Mr. Curry stated that will come in two levels. 1) Financial incentives, and 2) the Council does have to ratify the Commission's decision to sell the land to a developer. The bigger of those two is the financial involvement. If there is the opportunity to have conversations with Council to begin to flesh out what those financial considerations could look like, it will better inform developers. This is not an easy project, but it is a desirable project for developers.

3. VARIOUS REDEVELOPMENT AREAS: Potential Acquisitions for Development Using Neighborhood Stabilization Program Funds

Ms. Blue stated that the City applied for and received \$2.5 million in Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds. The program was authorized under the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, and it is

pre-stimulus. It falls under the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The funds travel through the State's Department of Commerce Division of Community Assistance, and they were the granting agent to the City. The funds are targeted towards mitigating the negative effects of foreclosures on neighborhoods. They are looking for areas where high rates of foreclosure are impacting neighborhoods. They can purchase property, demolish property, and redevelop property. They are looking at two major focus areas: development of permanent supportive housing, \$600,000 is set aside for this; and targeted acquisitions with the remaining \$1.9 million. The Council-adopted plan identifies four neighborhoods as primary target areas: Eastside Park, Ole Asheboro, Arlington Park, and the Glenwood area. There is a larger eligible area surrounding these neighborhoods. They are looking for an area with clusters of opportunities and where they feel there is a strong potential for home ownership. Several clusters have been identified, but she cannot give specific property address at this point. There are some clusters in the E. Whittington Street area [in Ole Asheboro] and some clusters in the Glenwood area. Greensboro Habitat for Humanity also has a neighborhood stabilization program award. Staff is working with them for opportunities to partner up those dollars and also working with other agencies that have received statewide funds.

Chair Leimenstoll asked for more explanation on the two areas of involvement. Ms. Blue stated that permanent supportive housing is targeted towards the homeless or disabled and providing ongoing support to those households. That particular set of funds is being looked at for the entire target area, not the specific neighborhoods, because they are looking primarily for multifamily structures. The City would provide funding to a developer who would be acquiring, rehabilitating, and owning those units. Several requirements, including income restrictions, would be included on those projects. There would also be a supportive services provider who would provide those services. Targeted acquisitions would mean looking at foreclosed, abandoned, and blighted properties. They will be looking for clusters in an area where there is a good potential for conversion to ongoing homeownership, creating stability in the neighborhood. This is primarily older homes.

Ms. Chaney asked if the purchased properties would be rehabilitated and sold back to people in the community. Ms. Blue stated they would love to get people from the Glenwood area to buy in Glenwood. There would be owner occupancy restrictions, and the properties would have to be affordable to the homeowner.

Mr. Curry stated that this is not just a rehabilitation program, and some properties may need to be demolished and rebuilt by a developer to the City's standards and then follow the requirements for selling.

Ms. Blue stated that Habitat has their own grant and are acting individually on their own property acquisitions. But partnership opportunities are being explored within the City's identified clusters. The timeframe for this project is to have funds obligated by July. The Division of Community Assistance would like to see 50% of the funds obligated by May. So this will be taking place very soon.

4. EASTSIDE PARK REDEVELOPMENT AREA: Habitat for Humanity – Community Garden

Ms. Arkin stated that representatives for Habitat were present to discuss a community garden opportunity in the Eastside Park Neighborhood. This is a new proposal and is not connected to the proposal that came to the Commission a few months ago.

Winston McGregor, 2422 Camden Rd., Habitat for Humanity Executive Director, and Alison O'Keefe, 926 Belleview St., represented Habitat for Humanity. Ms. McGregor stated that Habitat has been involved with many of the things discussed today at every level. They appreciate the seriousness the Commission approaches each of these planning projects. They have done extensive work within Willow Oaks and Eastside Park and have worked closely with the Town Architect.

They picked this project of a community garden for two reasons. They have been involved in the neighborhood, building 30 houses and now building 20 townhomes. Through the reengagement with the neighborhood, they have begun to understand some of the interests and desires of the residents. Also, there has been an initiative within their Board to move beyond just building houses by looking at dealing more broadly with neighborhoods.

They found out that there has been interest in a garden, but it had lacked any traction. Habitat can bring some stability to that project. Habitat has secured a \$5,000 grant from a private donor to seed the community idea concept. There is now a group of 11 residents who have agreed to pay to lease a plot and who have been involved and participated in meetings. There is a landscape designer. There are covenant and bylaw pieces that have been developed with the neighbors. Habitat is willing to be the institutional continuity to the project. This will help put some resources into the project and make it more stable. Habitat needs the land to begin the project.

Habitat is seeking a lease for two years. They realize that the Commission may have redevelopment plans for the area. The garden will be constructed so that raised beds will be able to be moved to a new location. Three lots are under consideration for the garden: 207 and 209 Gillespie St. and 206 York. The residents like the front locations 207 and 209 provide along Gillespie St. They feel it is more of an entrance to the neighborhood and will showcase the garden more. But they are not against 206 York St. There is also more foot traffic across 206 York St. The garden will be fenced, so that may not be an issue. The railroad tracks are also across from the York lot. It is the sentiment of the residents that 207 or 209 Gillespie St. is more prestigious and more suitable for the garden. The twelve residents that met with Habitat the night before voted on a chair and vice chair and discussed covenant and appropriate fees. So the neighborhood is committed to the project.

Ms. McGregor requested that the Commission give Habitat the authorization to use one of the lots, to be determined by Habitat, in order to begin planting in the next couple of months. There may be a grading issue on 207 or 209 Gillespie St. but that has not been fully addressed. There are issues there with standing water. 206 York does not appear to have those issues. Ideally they would like to have the ability to work with the most appropriate lot.

Ms. Arkin stated that the last community garden proposed for the lots on Gillespie was not supported by staff because of a possibility for development. The City applied for a second NSP grant, but that grant was not awarded, so there is no specific plan for development at this point. The land is intended to be developed at some point. They have discussed the need for a request to vacate policy in the lease. This would allow the Commission to explore development opportunities and Habitat to move the garden to a new location. Staff originally had recommended 407 Gillespie St., but the community has continued to say the location is not appropriate. They feel the presented location is more ideal. Given that there are no current funding opportunities, staff is comfortable supporting the proposal for 209 or 207 Gillespie, as long as the Commission has the authority to request Habitat to vacate. Habitat has agreed to this. At the end of the two years the lease could be extended. This will also allow the Commission to see if the community garden concept has support in the neighborhood.

Ms. McGregor stated that funds are budgeted to move the garden if necessary.

Chair Leimenstoll asked how Habitat would be involved with the project. Ms. McGregor stated that Ms. O'Keefe would be involved as a point of contact through the summer. She would meet with the community group to help organize the project. This is a project the organization is paying attention to for their neighborhood activity development. She will play a key oversight role. The County Extension Service would help with the technical aspects of the garden.

Chair Leimenstoll asked what would take place between now and August. Ms. O'Keefe stated that summer would be dedicated to the construction of the garden, getting resident involvement, and looking for partnerships to help beautify the garden.

Ms. Rogers asked if anyone is anticipated to take over Ms. O'Keefe's role after she leaves. Ms. McGregor stated that were in the AmeriCorps application process. The organization is exploring support for the project.

Chair Leimenstoll stated that the continuity of having a role like Ms. O'Keefe is essential to the development of the community involvement with the garden. Ms. McGregor stated that project would have oversight by the organization, and they hope to expand the leadership role through the neighborhood. They are even open to the idea of a stipend position within the neighborhood.

Chair Leimenstoll asked if there was water on the site. Ms. McGregor stated that the water hookups are on the site, they would just need to hook up to the services.

Ms. Chaney asked if the lease would include an option to renew if no further development plans are made. Ms. Arkin stated that would be included as an initial two year term with annual renewals from there. The land is planned for residential development, but until that is a reality this is an appropriate location for a community garden.

Mr. Blackwood clarified the desire for the Commission to be able to terminate. He wanted to ensure that Habitat understands that at any point the Commission would be able to ask the garden to be moved. Mr. Curry stated that the proposal has a thirty-day notification. Chair Leimenstoll asked that be expanded to 60 days. Ms. Arkin stated that would not be an issue. Chair Leimenstoll suggested a timeframe that was appropriate for the growing season in order to avoid discouraging involvement. Ms. Blackwood also suggested that the lot have liability insurance, and Ms. McGregor agreed.

Ms. Rogers asked if they were to consider one of the three lots. Ms. Arkin stated that was the case and that staff has no preference on which lot was used. She did feel that lot 209 made more sense. Mr. Curry stated that staff would support a motion that would allow one of the three properties to be identified at a later time.

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the Habitat for Humanity request to lease the one of three properties located at 207 and 209 Gillespie St. and 206 York St. for the initial period of two years, with the option to extend for one year annually there after, with an appropriate notice to vacate clause, for use as a community garden, and any other terms acceptable to both parties, seconded by Ms. Rogers. The Commission voted unanimously, 5-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Leimenstoll, Mays, Rogers, Carmichael, Chaney. Nays: None.)

Chair Leimenstoll asked for an update for the project at the end of the first growing season and asked for Habitat to return to the Commission. Ms. McGregor invited all members to come by through the summer. Foothills Connect, Urban Harvest, and Kaboom were suggested as possible groups to contact.

Mr. Mays asked what had happened to the retail project on Highway 70. Ms. McGregor stated that the project has been put on hold. Mr. Mays asked if they were interested in selling it. Ms. McGregor stated they would likely consider that option.

5. SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

b. Technical Advisors for Development Selection Process

Mr. Curry stated this concerned creation of a group of technical advisors. The skill sets discussed are development and finance experience on major downtown infill developments, urban design and architecture, and community building and how to engage the community in development. He has discussed the idea with a variety of people. Two individuals have indicated a strong interest. They will probably need to go through some process of soliciting proposals for technical advisors.

Mr. Mays asked if they were now willing to pay for advisors. Mr. Curry stated in terms of the development and economic arena, he has talked with Matt Nichols. He was a member of the original S. Elm St. consultant team with ERA. He is now a partner in AE Com, a large development and economics firm. He will bring experience with the project and expertise in finance and development. Mitchell Silver, Planning Director for the City of Raleigh, is a highly respected planner, and he has an architectural background. He has had extensive experience with the downtown developments in Raleigh. He is also a great resource on how to engage community involvement and has worked with the City in that capacity in the past. Because he is a public employee compensation will likely be a little different than a private consultant. That has not been fleshed out yet. He will likely speak to some people to help with the design element over the next week or so. He asked the Commission for feedback on the approach to the advisory group.

Chair Leimenstoll expressed the Commission's appreciation for these efforts. He asked what led staff to these three areas of expertise. Mr. Curry stated they were looking to build on areas where staff may have a lack of expertise necessary. They also would prefer to look outside of the area for impartial input and to avoid a possible conflict.

Chair Leimenstoll stated from a design perspective this is very complicated. A design expert will be essential for the success of this project.

Mr. Curry stated that the compensation for private consultation might be set up as an on-call contract. Initially the contract would be to look at the development proposal, but there may be steps later where more advice might be necessary.

Chair Leimenstoll stated that it may work best for the design aspect to have someone who can bring the members along on all of the pieces.

Mr. Curry stated that if the Commission is in support of this approach, then staff could provide a full slate of possible advisors, probably 3 or 4, to the next meeting.

The Commission expressed that they were in support of the approach and would prefer to have only three members.

6. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

For information only, Ms. Arkin stated that staff has received a preliminary request from the owner of the Magnolia House to purchase the adjoining lot, 725 Platt St. Staff will be working with him to create a proposal.

Chair Leimenstoll asked if this will be a community issue. Ms. Arkin stated that it likely would.

Ms. Arkin presented the information that was requested at the last meeting about the S. Elm Street efforts. Chair Leimenstoll asked the members to review the documents for next time.

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Curry,
Secretary, HCD

DC/jd